UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,995	11/30/2001	Keith M. Arroyo	CROSS1290-1	4032

25094	7590	10/14/2003

GRAY, CARY, WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
1221 SOUTH MOPAC EXPRESSWAY
SUITE 400
AUSTIN, TX 78746-6875

EXAMINER
EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	2

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/002,995		ARROYO ET AL.	
		Examiner		**Art Unit**	
		Bradley Edelman		2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 November 2001</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 November 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first office action on the merits of this application. The application is a

continuation of Application No. 09/259,160, now U.S. Patent No. 6,341,315. Claims 1-

58 are presented for examination.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created
doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the
unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent
and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11
F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225
USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA
1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*,
418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be
used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double
patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly
owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a
terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with
37 CFR 3.73(b).

1.   Claims 1-58 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-

type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of U.S. Patent No.

6,341,315 (hereinafter '315). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are

not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons.

In considering claim 1, '315 claim 1 discloses a method for processing a

command to a SATD through a first router, capable of communicating using a first

protocol (i.e. "SCSI router," '315 claim 1, lines 1-2), in a network having a first host,

capable of communicating using a second protocol different from the first protocol (i.e.

"Fibre Channel network having a plurality of Fibre Channel hosts," '315 claim 1, lines 3-4), the method comprising in the first ("SCSI") router:

Receiving a command from the first host (step (a) of '315 claim 1);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming the data to the SATD (step (c) of '315 claim 1); and

If the command requires a data transfer smaller than the threshold size, storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and forwarding the data to the SATD (step (b) of '315 claim 1).

Although '315 claim 1 contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim 1 of the application (such as the use of a SCSI router, Fibre Channel, and a specific queuing method), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to omit those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more universal, generic manner.

In considering claim 2, steps (a) – (l) of the claim are all disclosed in respective steps (c)(1) – (c)(12) of '315 claim 1. Again, although '315 claim 1 contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim 2 of the application (such as SCSI and Fibre Channel), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to omit those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more universal, generic manner.

In considering claim 3, the claim is disclose in '315 claim 2.

In considering claim 4, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 3.

In considering claim 5, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 4.

In considering claim 6, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 5.

In considering claim 7, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 6.

In considering claim 8, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 7.

In considering claim 9, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 8.

In considering claim 10, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 9.

In considering claim 11, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 10.

In considering claim 12, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 11.

In considering claim 13, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 12.

In considering claims 14-16, each of these claims is disclosed in lines 1-4 of '315 claim 1.

In considering claim 17, '315 claim 14 discloses a method for processing a command to a SATD through a first router, capable of communicating using a first protocol (i.e. "SCSI router," '315 claim 14, lines 1-2), in a network having a first host, capable of communicating using a second protocol different from the first protocol (i.e. "Fibre Channel network having a plurality of Fibre Channel hosts," '315 claim 14, lines 3-4), the method comprising in the first ("SCSI") router:

Receiving a command from the first host (step (a) of '315 claim 14);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming the data from the SATD (step (c) of '315 claim 14); and

If the command requires a data transfer smaller than the threshold size, storing

the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and forwarding the

data to the first host (step (b) of '315 claim 14).

Although '315 claim 14 contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim

17 of the application (such as the use of a SCSI router, Fibre Channel, and a specific

queuing method), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

to omit those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more

universal, generic manner.

In considering claim 18, steps (a) – (k) of the claim are all disclosed in respective

steps (c)(1) – (c)(11) of '315 claim 14. Again, although '315 claim 14 contains additional

limitations that do not appear in claim 18 of the application (such as SCSI and Fibre

Channel), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to omit

those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more universal,

generic manner.

In considering claim 19, the claim is disclose in '315 claim 15.

In considering claim 20, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 16.

In considering claim 21, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 17.

In considering claim 22, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 18.

In considering claim 23, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 19.

In considering claim 24, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 20.

In considering claim 25, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 21.

In considering claim 26, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 22.

In considering claim 27, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 23.

In considering claims 28-30, each of these claims is disclosed in lines 1-4 of '315 claim 14.

In considering claim 31, '315 claim 24 discloses a method for processing a command to a RATD through a first router, capable of communicating using a first protocol (i.e. "SCSI router," '315 claim 24, lines 1-2), in a network having a first host, capable of communicating using a second protocol different from the first protocol (i.e. "Fibre Channel network having a plurality of Fibre Channel hosts," '315 claim 24, lines 3-4), the method comprising in the first ("SCSI") router:

Receiving a command from the first host (step (a) of '315 claim 24);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming the data to the RATD (step (c) of '315 claim 24); and

If the command requires a data transfer smaller than the threshold size, storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and forwarding the data to the RATD (step (b) of '315 claim 24).

Although '315 claim 24 contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim 31 of the application (such as the use of a SCSI router, Fibre Channel, and a specific queuing method), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

to omit those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more

universal, generic manner.

In considering claim 32, steps (a) – (m) of the claim are all disclosed in

respective steps (c)(1) – (c)(13) of '315 claim 24. Again, although '315 claim 24

contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim 32 of the application (such as

SCSI and Fibre Channel), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill

in the art to omit those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a

more universal, generic manner.

In considering claim 33, the claim is disclose in '315 claim 25.

In considering claim 34, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 26.

In considering claim 35, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 27.

In considering claim 36, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 28.

In considering claim 37, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 29.

In considering claim 38, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 30.

In considering claim 39, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 31.

In considering claim 40, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 32.

In considering claim 41, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 33.

In considering claims 42-44, each of these claims is disclosed in lines 1-4 of '315

claim 24.

In considering claim 45, '315 claim 34 discloses a method for processing a command to a RATD through a first router, capable of communicating using a first protocol (i.e. "SCSI router," '315 claim 34, lines 1-2), in a network having a first host, capable of communicating using a second protocol different from the first protocol (i.e. "Fibre Channel network having a plurality of Fibre Channel hosts," '315 claim 34, lines 3-4), the method comprising in the first ("SCSI") router:

Receiving a command from the first host (step (a) of '315 claim 34);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming the data from the RATD (step (c) of '315 claim 34); and

If the command requires a data transfer smaller than the threshold size, storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and forwarding the data to the first host (step (b) of '315 claim 34).

Although '315 claim 34 contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim 45 of the application (such as the use of a SCSI router, Fibre Channel, and a specific queuing method), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to omit those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more universal, generic manner.

In considering claim 46, steps (a) – (i) of the claim are all disclosed in respective steps (c)(1) – (c)(9) of '315 claim 34. Again, although '315 claim 34 contains additional limitations that do not appear in claim 46 of the application (such as SCSI and Fibre Channel), it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to omit

those extra limitations so that the claimed features could be used in a more universal,

generic manner.

In considering claim 47, the claim is disclose in '315 claim 35.

In considering claim 48, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 36.

In considering claim 49, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 37.

In considering claim 50, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 38.

In considering claim 51, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 39.

In considering claim 52, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 40.

In considering claim 53, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 41.

In considering claim 54, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 42.

In considering claim 55, the claim is disclosed in '315 claim 43.

In considering claims 56-58, each of these claims is disclosed in lines 1-4 of '315

claim 34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

In considering claim 48, the phrase "the one or more memory buffers" on lines 1-

2 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis. It appears that the claim should depend

from claim 46, which would provide sufficient antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 10-17, 24-31, 38-45, and 52-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Petersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,094, hereinafter

"Petersen"), in view of PR Newswire ("Seagate Software Certifies Exabyte Corporation's

Fibre Channel Router and DLT Tape Library," from PR Newswire, Nov. 16, 1998,

hereinafter "Seagate").

In considering claim 1, Peterson discloses a method for processing a command

to a target device through a first interface (fig. 2, col. 1, lines 11-35), comprising:

Receiving a command from a first host (col. 1, lines 11-35);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming

the data to the destination (col. 4, lines 59-61; col. 27, lines 51-64, wherein "streaming"

means sending the data immediately); and

If the command requires a transfer of data smaller than the threshold size,

storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and

forwarding the data to the destination (col. 5, lines 4-12; col. 27, lines 65-67, wherein

the commands are stored in the buffers until they reach a threshold size, at which point

they are forwarded).

However, Petersen does not disclose that the interface connects a host that uses

one protocol with a target (SATD) that uses a second protocol. Petersen instead

discloses the claim features discussed above, of only streaming data once the data

reaches a particular threshold. Petersen describes the use of such a method in a

general network interface without focusing on the type of networks involved, or the type

of commands made. Nonetheless, the use of a network interface to connect hosts

using one protocol (i.e. Fibre Channel hosts) with targets using another protocol (SCSI

targets) is well known as evidenced by Seagate. Seagate describes a Fibre Channel-

to-SCSI router used to transmit commands to a storage device (which would process

both read and write commands), wherein the targets use one protocol (SCSI) and the

hosts use another protocol (Fibre Channel) (see ¶ 4). Examiner takes official notice that

sequential access target devices in a SCSI system are well known. Given this

knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the

desirability and advantages of using the data transmission scheme taught by Petersen

in a Fibre Channel to SCSI Router connected to a SATD in order to further speed up the

data transfers to and from the device, thereby greatly increasing the flexibility for host

systems in composing and transmitting frames of data (see Peterson, col. 2, lines 47-

52; Seagate, ¶ 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to include the data transfer method taught by Petersen in the Fibre

Channel to SCSI Router taught by Seagate.

In considering claim 17, Peterson discloses a method for processing a command

to a target device through a first interface (fig. 2, col. 1, lines 11-35), comprising:

Receiving a command from a first host (col. 1, lines 11-35);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming

the data from the destination (col. 4, lines 59-61; col. 27, lines 51-64, wherein

"streaming" means sending the data immediately); and

If the command requires a transfer of data smaller than the threshold size,

storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and

forwarding the data to the first host (col. 5, lines 4-12; col. 27, lines 65-67, wherein the

commands are stored in the buffers until they reach a threshold size, at which point they

are forwarded).

However, Petersen does not disclose that the interface connects a host that uses

one protocol with a target (SATD) that uses a second protocol. Petersen instead

discloses the claim features discussed above, of only streaming data once the data

reaches a particular threshold. Petersen describes the use of such a method in a

general network interface, without focusing on the type of networks involved, or the

specific commands made. Nonetheless, the use of a network interface to connect hosts

using one protocol (i.e. Fibre Channel hosts) with targets using another protocol (SCSI

targets) is well known as evidenced by Seagate. Seagate describes a Fibre Channel-

to-SCSI router used to transmit commands to a storage device (which would process

both read and write commands), wherein the targets use one protocol (SCSI) and the

hosts use another protocol (Fibre Channel) (see ¶ 4). Examiner takes official notice that

sequential access target devices in a SCSI system are well known. Given this

knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the

desirability and advantages of using the data transmission scheme taught by Petersen

in a Fibre Channel to SCSI Router connected to a SATD in order to further speed up the

data transfers to and from the device, thereby greatly increasing the flexibility for host

systems in composing and transmitting frames of data (see Peterson, col. 2, lines 47-

52; Seagate, ¶ 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to include the data transfer method taught by Petersen in the Fibre

Channel to SCSI Router taught by Seagate.

In considering claim 31, Peterson discloses a method for processing a command

to a target device through a first interface (fig. 2, col. 1, lines 11-35), comprising:

Receiving a command from a first host (col. 1, lines 11-35);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming

the data to the destination (col. 4, lines 59-61; col. 27, lines 51-64, wherein "streaming"

means sending the data immediately); and

If the command requires a transfer of data smaller than the threshold size,

storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and

forwarding the data to the destination (col. 5, lines 4-12; col. 27, lines 65-67, wherein

the commands are stored in the buffers until they reach a threshold size, at which point they are forwarded).

However, Petersen does not disclose that the interface connects a host that uses one protocol with a target (RATD) that uses a second protocol. Petersen instead discloses the claim features discussed above, of only streaming data once the data reaches a particular threshold. Petersen describes the use of such a method in a general network interface, without focusing on the type of networks involved or the types of commands made. Nonetheless, the use of a network interface to connect hosts using one protocol (i.e. Fibre Channel hosts) with targets using another protocol (SCSI targets) is well known as evidenced by Seagate. Seagate describes a Fibre Channel-to-SCSI router used to transmit commands to a storage device (which would process both read and write commands), wherein the targets use one protocol (SCSI) and the hosts use another protocol (Fibre Channel) (see ¶ 4). Examiner takes official notice that random access target devices in a SCSI system are well known. Given this knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using the data transmission scheme taught by Petersen in a Fibre Channel to SCSI Router connected to a RATD in order to further speed up the data transfer to and from the device, thereby greatly increasing the flexibility for host systems in composing and transmitting frames of data (see Peterson, col. 2, lines 47-52; Seagate, ¶ 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the data transfer method taught by Petersen in the Fibre Channel to SCSI Router taught by Seagate.

In considering claim 45, Peterson discloses a method for processing a command

to a target device through a first interface (fig. 2, col. 1, lines 11-35), comprising:

Receiving a command from a first host (col. 1, lines 11-35);

If the command requires a transfer of data larger than a threshold size, streaming

the data from the destination (col. 4, lines 59-61; col. 27, lines 51-64, wherein

"streaming" means sending the data immediately); and

If the command requires a transfer of data smaller than the threshold size,

storing the data in one or more memory buffers as they become available and

forwarding the data to the first host (col. 5, lines 4-12; col. 27, lines 65-67, wherein the

commands are stored in the buffers until they reach a threshold size, at which point they

are forwarded).

However, Petersen does not disclose that the interface connects a host that uses

one protocol with a target (RATD) that uses a second protocol. Petersen instead

discloses the claim features discussed above, of only streaming data once the data

reaches a particular threshold. Petersen describes the use of such a method in a

general network interface, without focusing on the type of networks involved or the

types of commands made. Nonetheless, the use of a network interface to connect

hosts using one protocol (i.e. Fibre Channel hosts) with targets using another protocol

(SCSI targets) is well known as evidenced by Seagate. Seagate describes a Fibre

Channel-to-SCSI router used to transmit commands to a storage device (which would

process both read and write commands), wherein the targets use one protocol (SCSI)

and the hosts use another protocol (Fibre Channel) (see ¶ 4). Examiner takes official

notice that random access target devices in a SCSI system are well known. Given this

knowledge, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the

desirability and advantages of using the data transmission scheme taught by Petersen

in a Fibre Channel to SCSI Router connected to a RATD in order to further speed up

the data transfer to and from the device, thereby greatly increasing the flexibility for host

systems in composing and transmitting frames of data (see Peterson, col. 2, lines 47-

52; Seagate, ¶ 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to include the data transfer method taught by Petersen in the Fibre

Channel to SCSI Router taught by Seagate.

In considering claims 10, 24, 38, and 52, Seagate further discloses that the

commands are read and write commands (i.e. Seagate describes data transfers

between a host and a data storage, which inherently includes read and write

commands).

In considering claims 11, 25, 39, and 53, Petersen does not disclose that the

network comprises a single host. Nonetheless, the number of hosts on a network is a

mere matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to implement a network with a single host in order to keep the network

configuration as simple as possible.

In considering claims 12, 26, 40, and 54, neither Petersen nor Seagate explicitly disclose the use of a plurality of routers. Nonetheless, the number of routers on a network is a mere matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to implement a network with a plurality of routers to avoid bottleneck problems.

In considering claim 13, 27, 41, and 55, in a system with a plurality of routers used for routing information to a network device, each of those routers will necessarily be communicatively connected to the network device.

In considering claims 14-16, 28-30, 42-44, and 56-58, as discussed above, Seagate discloses that the first protocol is a SCSI protocol, the second protocol is a Fibre Channel protocol, and the router is a Fibre Channel-to-SCSI router (¶ 4).

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   Claims 2-9, 18-23, 32-37, and 46-51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and if a terminal disclaimer is filed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to disclose or render obvious all of the limitations of claims 2, 18, 32, and 46.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

For all correspondences: (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

BE
October 6, 2003

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100